

## MEMORANDUM

28 February 2000

TO: Lompoc Interagency Work Group Members (See Attached Distribution List)

SUBJECT: MEETING SUMMARY – January 20, 2000

**Members present:** Advocates for a Clean Environment – Deb Robinson; Air Resources Board - Lynn Baker; Celite Corporation - Chris Pauley; City of Lompoc - Stacy Lawson; Department of Health Services – Martha Harnly, Rick Kreutzer, Sharon Seidel; Department of Pesticide Regulation – Madeline Brattesani, Paul Gosselin, Lisa Ross, Jim Sanborn, Jay Schreider, Randy Segawa; Farm Bureau – Steve Jordan; Lompoc Growers - Richard Quandt; Lompoc community members-at-large - Joyce Howerton, Dave Pierce; Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment - Richard Ames, Michael DiBartolomeis, Joy Wisniewski; Santa Barbara County Agricultural Commissioner's Office - Joe Karl; Santa Barbara County Health Care Services - Elliott Schulman; Senator O'Connell's Office - Carla Frisk; U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Headquarters - Jake Mackenzie (Facilitator, Lompoc Interagency Work Group); U.S. EPA, Region IX - Ray Chavira; Volunteers for a Healthy Valley - George Rauh.

**Members absent:** Assemblyman Maldonado's Office – Melanie Bedwell; City of Lompoc - Dick DeWees; Department of Health Services – Christine Arnesen; Department of Pesticide Regulation – John Sanders, Pam Wofford; Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment – Anna Fan; Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District - Duane Sikorski; Santa Barbara County Supervisor Gray's Office - Susan Warnstrom; Santa Barbara County Supervisor Marshall's Office - John Buttny; UC Extension Agricultural Engineer – Bill Steinke; U. S. EPA, Region IX – Karen Heisler; Volunteer - Robert Holtzer.

**TOPIC #1: Introductions.** LIWG members and observers (Susan Zavolta, City of Lompoc, and Ray Brinkmeyer, Dow AgroSciences) introduced themselves.

**TOPIC #2: Approve November 8 meeting summary.** Ray Chavira and Stacy Lawson provided comments to amend the meeting summary. They also initiated a discussion about whether the LIWG needs a different mechanism to record information at its meetings.

**ACTION:** The LIWG agreed to delay the final approval of the meeting summary and the discussion of how to record meeting information until the LIWG's next meeting.

**TOPIC #4: Review agenda.** Rick Kreutzer asked, and the LIWG agreed, to set aside time at the end of this meeting to discuss the possibility of devoting each meeting to one key issue, focusing on one subgroup at a time.

**TOPIC #5: Report on the status of the recommendations on Key Issue #1** [Key Issue #1: Does sickness occur in the community? If so, what kind(s) and at what rate(s)? Are illness rates higher than expected? ]

Dick Ames briefed the LIWG on the status of its request for 1995-97 data from the Office of Statewide Health and Planning Development (OSHPD). He has received the data and has begun the data analysis. He plans to

extend the trends from 1991-94 to include the more recent data and examine them. He anticipates that the report may be available in about two and a half months.

Rick and Elliot asked the LIWG to think about what action the LIWG would recommend based on possible findings of the review of the more recent hospital discharge data (e.g., increase, decrease, or no change in rates of respiratory illnesses from the early 1990s).

**ACTION:** Dick Ames will provide the LIWG an update on the status of the OSHPD data analysis at its next meeting.

Elliot Schulman briefly updated the LIWG on the activities of this subgroup. Since the LIWG's last meeting, the Key Issue #1 subgroup has met twice to discuss the following question: What is the value of the Key Issue #1 recommendations that were forwarded to the LIWG and that we are implementing? The subgroup discussed whether the LIWG should choose a different approach. What we do with this health data is the key point; several choices exist.

The health subgroup discussed whether the original decision tree was flawed. If so, is there something to be done in place of it? Some subgroup members agreed that to continue mining the health data we have would not produce any new information. Some subgroup members felt that monitoring data is needed to focus on health end points. The LIWG held a lengthy discussion of these issues, but did not come to consensus about whether to continue with the current approach.

**ACTION:** At the next LIWG meeting, the Key Issue #1 subgroup will hold a workshop to discuss what health activities are meaningful to do and look at for residents, policy makers, scientists and the regulatory process. The subgroup will present the LIWG with a proposal for action on how to approach the health issues. Based on this information, the LIWG will reach consensus on what approach to use to address this key issue.

Dick Ames briefed the LIWG on the status of the proposal for a community health survey and its funding. He has written the proposal. It has been peer reviewed in his department and is currently undergoing review by OEHHHA management. Then, he can present the proposal to the Key Issue #1 health subgroup. The LIWG discussed this proposal and raised a variety of points and questions about health studies. First, there was no rationale provided for the proposal. Some members wanted to know what questions would be answered by the proposal. Second, the proposal, as described, would involve extensive exposure assessment and field work that would cost a great deal of money (one person estimated \$1 million). Given the difficulty in finding funds for the pesticide monitoring, where would sufficient funds be found for this proposal? Third, it was not clear how this proposal differed from that of the health subcommittee other than that it proposed to do everything at once regardless of results from the pesticide monitoring. In contrast, the health subcommittee recommendation was to perform more extensive studies if exposure data indicated the need.

**ACTION:** Dick Ames will update the LIWG on the status of the proposal for a community health survey at its next LIWG meeting.

Per its request, Elliot Schulman provided the LIWG an update of the latest statistics on cancer incidence in Lompoc (Handout #1).

**TOPIC #6: Report on the status of the recommendations on Key Issue #2** [Key Issue #2: Are Lompoc residents exposed to pesticides in air? If so, which pesticides, and in what amounts? Do those levels exceed

human health standards?]

Randy Segawa provided a brief description of the fumigant sampling and data analysis that is underway (Handout #2). The plan has received conditional approval from the U.S. EPA. Monitoring has begun: a metam sodium application was monitored the week of January 10, 2000. Some problems with sampling breakthrough were identified early in the project and have been addressed; however, DPR will wait to see the results of this application before monitoring a second application. The LIWG had a discussion that if DPR learned of a second application close to town, DPR would consult with U.S. EPA and ARB regarding whether to conduct additional monitoring.

**ACTION:** The LIWG requested that DPR provide an update on this project at its next meeting.

Randy updated the LIWG on the Technical Advisory Group's (TAG) discussions as they move forward to develop the monitoring plan for Phase Two/Non-fumigant pesticides air monitoring for spring/summer 2000. On behalf of the TAG, he asked the LIWG to review several options for sampling and analysis of the candidate pesticides (Handout #3) and reach a consensus about the following key issues.

(1) Should we conduct ambient monitoring, or monitor at and near the perimeter of specific applications?

**ACTION:** The LIWG agreed on ambient monitoring.

(2) Which pesticides do we monitor? How do we balance the number of pesticides with the number of samples?

**ACTION:** The LIWG agreed to hire a consultant to help answer these questions.

(3) It is likely that UCD can submit an acceptable proposal for the GC-method pesticides. Alternatively, we may identify a superior proposal through an open bid process. Assuming a UCD proposal is acceptable, do we contract with UCD for the GC analysis or have an open bid process for everything?

**ACTION:** The LIWG requested that the TAG ask UCD to submit a proposal for the 30 pesticides that may be analyzed by GC in a single analysis with acceptable detection limits for TAG review. The LIWG suggested we evaluate the other pesticides with a consultant.

(4) Do we include a second lab?

**ACTION:** The LIWG asked that this question be held off until its next meeting.

(5) What should be used as the goal for detection limits? Most TAG members propose some fraction of the screening levels. Some TAG members propose that we attempt to achieve the lowest detection limits possible.

**ACTION:** The LIWG asked to discuss this item at its next meeting.

(6) Should we hire a consultant?

**ACTION:** The LIWG advised DPR that the TAG wants to hire a consultant for Phase Two/Non-fumigant pesticide air monitoring, especially to evaluate pesticides that cannot be analyzed at UCD. DPR suggested that the TAG clearly specify what it wants the consultant to do so that the terms of the contract can be specific. The TAG requested that LIWG members submit suggestions for consultants (and their credentials) to the TAG as soon as possible.

At the LIWG's request, DPR provided the most up-to-date pesticide use reporting information available (see Handout #4).

**ACTION:** The LIWG requested that Steve Jordan e-mail the LIWG as to the reason why 1992 fumigant use amounts are so different than in the other years reported.

**TOPIC #7: Report on the status of the recommendations on Key Issue #3** [Key Issue #3: What other environmental hazards and factors exist in Lompoc?]

Ray Chavira briefed the LIWG on the status of the meteorology study. The City of Lompoc is the lead agency on this study. The LIWG discussed how DPR would transfer funds to the City of Lompoc for this study. The purpose is to characterize the strength, height and prevalence of low-level inversions over the course of a year and to account for daily and seasonal changes in the Lompoc Valley by collecting data using mini-sodar and meteorological towers. The subgroup is discussing the data quality objectives. They plan to start the meteorology study concurrent with Phase Two/Non-fumigant pesticide air monitoring. Ray informed the LIWG that due to other commitments, he will not be able to continue as chair of this subgroup, but he will try to assist with the Request for Proposals for the meteorology study. The LIWG thanked Ray Chavira for his hard work and access to his brain on these issues.

**ACTIONS:**

- (1) Randy Segawa, DPR, will work with Susan Zavolta, City of Lompoc, to transfer funds.
- (2) The LIWG asked Stacy Lawson to chair this subgroup. Stacy agreed; she also requested Lynn Baker as co-chair.
- (3) The LIWG requested that the Vandenberg Air Force Base make a presentation on its rocket launches at its next meeting in the evening when it's more convenient for the public to attend.

**TOPIC #8: Next meeting date, time, and location:** The LIWG plans to meet next on Thursday, March 30 in Lompoc (location to be decided). It will hold two meetings: (1) Key Issues #2 and #3 from 2 – 5 pm, and (2) a workshop on Key Issue #1 from 6:30 – 9 pm. The afternoon meeting will have the format of a regular LIWG meeting. The purpose of the workshop is to re-examine the work plan, summarize all health data collected so far, to address what other health data could be collected, and for the subgroup to put forward a proposal for action. Written documents will be provided to support presentations. The workshop will also include the presentation from Vandenberg Air Force Base on its rocket launches. More information on the agenda and the location will be provided at a later date. Please contact me, or Jake Mackenzie at (707) 584-1195, if you have questions about this meeting summary.

Respectfully submitted,

Madeline Brattesani, Ph. D.  
Department of Pesticide Regulation  
Environmental Monitoring & Pest Management Branch  
830 K Street  
Sacramento, California 95814-3510  
Phone/Fax/E-mail: (916) 324-4082/(916) [324-4088/ mbrattesani@cdpr.ca.gov](mailto:mbrattesani@cdpr.ca.gov)

cc: Paul Gosselin, DPR  
John Sanders, DPR

Attachments

Handouts distributed at the January 20, 2000 meeting. Hard copies will be mailed only to those members not in Attendance, or to those individuals requesting copies.

1. Letter from Dr. Nasser, Santa Barbara County Public Health Department, regarding update of the latest statistics on cancer incidence in Lompoc (dated 12/28/99).
2. DPR handouts on the fumigant sampling and analysis plan.
3. Lompoc Pesticide Air Monitoring. Options for Phase 2 – Non-fumigant Pesticides (dated 1/14/00).
4. DPR's pesticide use report (1991-1998) for the Lompoc region (1/14/00).

**Member Distribution List:**

Advocates for a Clean Environment/Deb Robinson  
Air Resources Board/Lynn Baker  
Assembly Member Maldonado's Office/Melanie Bedwell, Julia King  
Celite Corporation/Chris Pauley  
City of Lompoc/Dick DeWees, Stacy Lawson  
Farm Bureau/Steve Jordan  
Department of Health Services/Christine Arnesen, Martha Harnly, Rick Kreutzer, Sharon Seidel  
Department of Pesticide Regulation/Madeline Brattesani, Lisa Ross, Jim Sanborn, John Sanders, Jay Schreider, Randy Segawa, Pam Wofford  
Lompoc Growers/Richard Quandt  
Lompoc Resident/Joyce Howerton, Dave Pierce  
Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment/Richard Ames, Michael DiBartolomeis, Anna Fan, Joy Wisniewski  
Santa Barbara County Agricultural Commissioner's Office/Joe Karl  
Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District/Duane Sikorski  
Santa Barbara County Health Care Services/Elliott Schulman  
Santa Barbara County Supervisor Gray's Office/Susan Warnstrom  
Santa Barbara County Supervisor Marshall's Office/John Buttney  
Senator O'Connell's Office/Carla Frisk  
UC Extension Agricultural Engineer/Bill Steinke  
U.S. EPA, Headquarters/Jake Mackenzie  
U.S. EPA, Region IX/Ray Chavira, Karen Heisler  
Volunteer/Robert Holtzer (formerly with Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment as a Medical Officer)  
Volunteers for a Healthy Valley/George Rauh